

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment responds to the July 3, 2003, Office action.

Claims 8 through 14 are pending in the application.

The applicants thank the Examiner for conducting a telephone interview with the applicant's attorney on October 2 and 3, 2003.

1. Rejection of Claims 8, 9, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejects claims 8, 9, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), stating that the claims are anticipated by U.K. Patent Application Number GB 2,211,312. The applicants traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

The Examiner argues that the GB 2,211,312 application discloses all of the limitations recited in claims 8, 9, and 14. The GB 2,211,312 application, however, fails to disclose a "first roller being movably arranged so that an axis of the first roller is displaceable along a path defined by a circle arc having a center that substantially coincides with an axis of a driving gear or wheel" as required by claims 8, 9, and 14. The GB 2,211,312 application discloses that "[t]he frame 12 is moved by an actuator including a motor 23 via an appropriate mechanism which converts a turning movement of an output shaft (not shown) of the motor 23 to a linear movement of the frame 12 along the guide rails 22." (See the GB 2,211,312 application on page 6 at lines 3 through 7.) Neither of the rollers 15 and 20 of the GB 2,211,312 application can be "movably arranged so that an axis of the first roller is displaceable along a path defined by a circle arc having a center that substantially coincides with an axis of" motor 23 as required by claims 8, 9, and 14. The output shaft of the motor 23 of the GB 2,211,312 application only moves the rollers 15 and 20 on frame 12 in a linear movement along the guide rails 22. This rejection should therefore be withdrawn.

2. Allowable Subject Matter


The Examiner objects to claims 10 through 13, stating that the claims are dependent upon a rejected base claim and that the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The applicants believe that the base claim 8 is allowable for the reasons discussed above. Since claims 10 through 13 are believed to depend upon an allowable base claim, the applicants choose not to rewrite claims 10 through 13 in independent form.

3. Conclusion

The application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

for  *Att.* Reg. No. 30,754
Robert C. Faber
Registration No.: 24,322
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

RCF:PG:crg